1	PATRICK D. ROBBINS (CABN 152288) Acting United States Attorney	
2 3	MARTHA BOERSCH (CABN 126569) Chief, Criminal Division  ABRAHAM FINE (CABN 292647) MOLLY PRIEDEMAN (CABN 302096)	
4		
5	LLOYD FARNHAM (CABN 202231) Assistant United States Attorneys	
6 7	1301 Clay Street, Suite 340S Oakland, California 94612	
8	Telephone: (510) 637-3717 FAX: (510) 637-3724	
9	Abraham.fine@usdoj.gov Molly.priedeman@usdoj.gov Lloyd.farnham@usdoj.gov	
10   11	Attorneys for United States of America	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14	OAKLAND DIVISION	
15	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO. CR 25-CR-0003-YGR
16	Plaintiff, )	NOTICE OF ERRATA IN UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO
17	v.	MODIFY FILTER PROCESS
18	SHENG THAO, ANDRE JONES, )	
19	DAVID TRUNG DUONG, AND ANDY HUNG DUONG, )	
20		
21		
22		
23   24		
2 <del>4</del>   25		
26   26		
20   27		
28		
	NOTICE OF ERRATA 1	

CR 25-CR-0003-YGR

In the government's opposition to Defendant's motion to modify filter process, the government included, among a number of other cases, the following case cite: United States v. Jarman, 847 F.3d 259, 266 (5th Cir. 2017) (approving government's use of filter team and stating that the "Second, Third, Fourth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Circuits, in at least some cases, have also either approved of or recognized and declined to criticize the use of government filter teams to screen materials for privilege before items are released to the investigators in the case."). See Dkt. No. 56 at 7.

In his reply brief, Defendant David Duong correctly asserts that this quoted language does not appear in the Fifth Circuit's Jarman opinion. See Dkt. No. 61 at 3-4. The language the government quoted in its opposition brief is actually from an Eleventh Circuit decision discussing the *Jarman* case, but the contents of the quoted passage are otherwise correct. The citation should read as follows: See In Re: Sealed Search Warrant and Application for a Warrant by Telephone or Other Reliable Electronic Means, 11 F.4th 1235, 1249 (11th Cir. 2021) (discussing the Fifth Circuit's Jarman opinion and stating "[t]he Second, Third, Fourth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Circuits, in at least some cases, have also either approved of or recognized and declined to criticize the use of government filter teams to screen materials for privilege before items are released to the investigators in the case.").

PATRICK D. ROBBINS

 $/_{S}/$ 

The government apologizes for this citation error.

DATED: April 10, 2025 Respectfully submitted,

Acting United States Attorney

21

ABRAHAM FINE MOLLY K. PRIEDEMAN LLOYD FARNHAM

Assistant United States Attorneys

26 27

28